



STATE OF UTAH
NATURAL RESOURCES
Oil, Gas & Mining

Scott M. Matheson, Governor
Temple A. Reynolds, Executive Director
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Division Director

4241 State Office Building • Salt Lake City, UT 84114 • 801-533-5771

January 17, 1985

TO: D. Wayne Hedberg, Permit Supervisor/Reclamation
Hydrologist

FROM: Mary M. Boucek, Permit Supervisor/Reclamation Biologist MB

RE: Amendment to Koosharem Clay Mine Plan, Interstate
Brick Company, ACT/031/002, Piute County, Utah

The review of this amendment has recently been completed by Tom Munson, Steve Cox, Ev Hooper, Rick Smith and Pam Grubaugh-Littig. The following comments have been generated during this review:

Rule M-3(1)(a)

The recently submitted map needs the permit area outlined and the disturbed area outlined.

Rule M-3(1)(d) and M-10(8)

The issue of surface waters appears to have been questionably handled.

Rule M-3(1)(f)

Has the company demonstrated that there is indeed no ground water to be affected by operations?

Rule M-3(2)(c) and (d)

The recent submission alludes to final stabilization, but it is unclear how the final configuration will actually be attained. The applicant states that the disturbed materials will either be backfilled into the pit or regraded. This leads to the question of what exactly the final configuration will be. What is the anticipated pit depth?

Page 2
Memorandum - D. Wayne Hedberg
ACT/031/002
January 17, 1985

Rule M-5

The bond estimate will need to be revised to reflect the costs needed for the state (a third party) to perform the reclamation tasks. The revised bond estimate will need to reflect any revegetation changes and hydrology changes made in the plan as well.

Rule M-10(12)

*Delek
SC* The applicant has addressed deficiencies regarding revegetation. However, an on-site assessment by the Division is warranted to determine success of reclamation efforts to date and whether or not the plan needs to be revised in this regard.

Rule M-10(14)

The applicant proposes to use only one inch of soil at the time of reclamation, yet photographs of the area ^{seem to} indicate ~~that~~ there are two to three feet of topsoil in the area. This indicates that an insufficient amount of topsoil was saved.

The unanimous consensus among the reviewers is that a site visit is definitely warranted before a more definitive assessment can be made. This site visit should involve Steve, Ev, Tom and Rick and should be conducted when weather permits.

btb
8834R-34 & 35